

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR  
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware  
corporation, and FAIRCHILD  
SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a  
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 04-1371 JJF

**POWER INTEGRATIONS' REVISED [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT  
AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - VALIDITY**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT**

1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Claim 4: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

2. If you answered "YES" to question 1, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the '851 Patent was obvious.

---



---

**VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT**

3. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 9 of the '366 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

4. If you answered "YES" to question 3, indicate below any reference you have determined anticipates claim 9 of the '366 Patent.

---



---

5. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Claim 14: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

6. If you answered "YES" to question 5, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the '366 Patent was obvious.

---

---

#### **VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '876 PATENT**

7. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '876 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

8. If you answered "YES" to question 7, indicate below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining Claim 1 of the '876 Patent was obvious.

---

---

**VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT**

9. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '075 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

10. If you answered "YES" to question 9, indicate below any reference you have determined anticipates claim 1 of the '075 Patent.

---

---

11. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '075 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Claim 5: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(FORM CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE)**

12. If you answered “YES” to question 11, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the ’075 Patent was obvious.

---

---

You must each sign this Verdict Form:      Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (foreperson) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on September 20, 2007, I electronically filed with the Clerk of Court **POWER INTEGRATIONS' REVISED [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - VALIDITY** using CM/ECF which will send electronic notification of such filing(s) to the following Delaware counsel. In addition, the filing will also be sent via hand delivery:

Steven J. Balick, Esq.  
John G. Day, Esq.  
Ashby & Geddes  
222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor  
P. O. Box 1150  
Wilmington, DE 19899

I hereby certify that on September 20, 2007, I have served the document(s) to the following non-registered participants via hand delivery:

G. Hopkins Guy, III  
Gabriel M. Ramsey  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP  
c/o Sheraton Suites, Legal A  
422 Delaware Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19801

Attorneys for Defendants  
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR  
INTERNATIONAL, INC. and  
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR  
CORPORATION

---

William J. Marsden, Jr. (marsden@fr.com)